UNITED	STATES	DISTRICT	COURT
DISTRI	ICT OF N	MASSACHU	SETTS

4
A
ļ

TAMMY WALKER,)
Plaintiff)
v.)
CITY OF HOLYOKE, Defendant)

COMPLAINT

PARTIES

- 1. Plaintiff, Tammy Walker ("Walker"), is a natural person with a residence in Holyoke, Hampden County, Massachusetts.
- 2. Defendant, City of Holyoke (the "City") is a municipality located in, and existing under the laws of, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, with municipal offices at 536 Dwight Street, Holyoke, Hampden County, Massachusetts.

FACTS

- 3. Walker is an African American.
- 4. Walker is a lesbian.
- 5. Walker is a female.
- 6. In or around April of 1993, Walker was hired by the City's Police Department (the "Department").
- 7. On or around June 20, 1999, the former Mayor of Holyoke, Daniel Szostkiewicz, bypassed Walker and selected Joseph Garcia for promotion to the position of permanent full-time sergeant.
- 8. On or around October 15, 1999, Walker filed a charge of discrimination against the City with the Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination ("MCAD")

CF TO CL

- and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC"), alleging that the City discriminated against her when it bypassed her for promotion to sergeant. Walker also appealed her bypass to the Civil Service Commission.
- 9. In or around May of 2000, Walker and the City entered into an agreement to settle the MCAD and EEOC charge of discrimination and the civil service appeal ("Settlement Agreement"). In the Settlement Agreement, the City agreed to place Walker at the top of the eligibility list for the next promotion to sergeant. Additionally, the City agreed that upon Walker's appointment to sergeant, her seniority date would be adjusted to June 9, 1999.
- 10. On or around May 5, 2002, Walker was promoted to the position of full-time permanent sergeant. Pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, Walker's seniority date was to be adjusted to June 9, 1999.
- 11. Soon after her promotion to sergeant, Walker began having problems with other officers, including but not limited to Sergeant John Monaghan ("Sgt. Monaghan") and Sargent Garcia.
- 12. For instance, Sgt. Monaghan made comments with sexual and racial connotations over the police radio when Walker ended a radio transmission. During one such incident, Sgt. Monaghan changed his pronunciation to imitate an African American dialect and said, "lick it, lick it, good."
- 13. Walker also heard Sgt. Monaghan make racist remarks about others. For example, Sgt. Monaghan referred to Chief Anthony Scott, an African American, as "Uncle Charlie."
- 14. Additionally, Walker observed Sgt. Monaghan change his grammar and pronunciation to imitate an African American dialect when speaking about African Americans. For instance, Walker heard Sgt. Monaghan say "Uncle Charlie done come out wit (with) anutter (another) order."
- 15. In or around June of 2002, Walker began to make complaints to her superiors about the discriminatory and harassing behavior of Sgt. Monaghan and Sgt. Garcia.
- Despite Walker's complaints, Sgt. Monaghan continued engaging in discriminatory and harassing behavior.
- 17. For instance, Sgt. Monaghan regularly referred to Walker as "Tyrone," a stereotypical African American, male name.
- 18. Sgt. Monaghan also stated that Walker should not be a sergeant because of her lesbian lifestyle.

- 19. In or around October of 2002, Sgt. Monaghan leaned over Walker and sang "You shouldn't go sticking your tongue where it don't belong."
- 20. After Sgt. Monaghan sang this offensive song, Walker complained again to her superiors.
- 21. Walker also complained to Chief Scott about the discriminatory and harassing behavior of Sgt. Monaghan on several occasions.
- 22. At Chief Scott's suggestion, Walker spoke to Cpt. Fletcher about the discriminatory and harassing behavior of Sgt. Monaghan. During this conversation, Cpt. Fletcher acknowledged that he was aware that other officers were unhappy about Walker's seniority because of her gender and race. Cpt. Fletcher told Walker that if she pursued any action against Sgt. Monaghan, others in the department might retaliate against her for bringing an action against a fellow officer.
- 23. Cpt. Fletcher also said that Walker's problems with Sgt. Monaghan were brought about because she obtained an "incorrect" seniority date through the settlement of her charge of discrimination and civil service appeal. Cpt. Fletcher told Walker that she could end the problems by "correcting" her seniority date.
- 24. On or around October 24, 2002, Walker filed a complaint with the Department regarding the discriminatory and harassing behavior of Sgt. Monaghan.
- 25. On or around December 2, 2002, Walker filed a charge of discrimination with the MCAD and EEOC, against the Department regarding the actions of Monaghan and other employees of the Department. Walker complained that the Department had discriminated against her based on her gender, color, and sexual orientation, and interfered with her exercise and enjoyment of her civil rights.
- On or around December 4, 2004, the Department received a statement from another officer who heard some of the discriminatory comments made by Sgt. Monaghan. Nevertheless, the Department decided that Walker's complaints against Sgt. Monaghan were "unfounded."
- 27. In or around June of 2003, Walker verbally reported to her supervisor that several members of the Department had refused to leave a pub after closing, in violation of the law ("Pub Incident Report").
- 28. After no action was taken as a result of her Pub Incident Report, Walker notified Chief Scott of what she believed was the illegal conduct that she reported in the Pub Incident Report.

- 29. In or around August of 2003, Chief Scott retaliated against Walker for notifying him about the possible illegal activity she reported in the Pub Incident Report. Chief Scott issued a written reprimand stating that Walker had been insubordinate when she notified him of the Pub Incident report.
- 30. In or around April of 2004, Chief Scott suspended Walker from work for one (1) day for appearing five to fifteen minutes late for court. Chief Scott partially justified this suspension based on the retaliatory written reprimand that he issued in August of 2003. Other employees of the Department were not similarly disciplined for arriving at court five to fifteen minutes late.
- 31. In upholding the one (1) day suspension, the Mayor of Holyoke, Michael Sullivan, also mentioned the retaliatory written reprimand for insubordination in August, 2003.
- 32. In or around September of 2004, Walker filed a written complaint with her supervisor, which stated that Sgt. Monaghan was ignoring her while they are performing their duties and verbally assaulting her. Walker stated that she believed that Sgt. Monaghan's insubordinate conduct posed a risk to her own safety and the safety of others.
- 33. Less than two (2) weeks after Walker complained about Sgt. Monaghan and her safety concerns, Mayor Sullivan doubled a five (5) day suspension that had been issued earlier to Walker by Chief Scott.
- 34. In or around November of 2004, Walker noticed that she was not hearing any dispatch calls over her car radio or hand held radio and, as a result, did not know where her subordinates were in the field.
- 35. Walker believed that her supervisor, Lieutenant Eva O'Connell, had ordered the dispatchers to send calls via email, which would preclude Walker from hearing them. Walker believed that this practice posed a serious risk to the health and safety of the police officers and the public as well as herself.
- 36. On or around November 4, 2004, Walker made a report to Chief Scott regarding the practice of sending dispatch calls via email (the "Dispatch Email Report"). Walker expressed her belief that such a practice was unsafe for the police officers and the public as well as herself.
- 37. On or around November 10, 2004, within days of Walker's report to Chief Scott about the dispatch calls, Lt. O'Connell retaliated against Walker by reprimanding her about her failure to utilize the chain of command and reassigning her to inside duty.

- 38. On or around November 20, 2004, Lt. O'Connell denied a request for a day off which Walker had submitted several days earlier so that she could care for an ill family member.
- 39. Additionally, on November 20, 2004, Lt. O'Connell requested that Chief Scott place Walker on the sick leave abuser's list.
- 40. In or around the end of November of 2004, Chief Scott suspended Walker for five (5) days for sick leave abuse. At the end of December of 2004, Mayor Sullivan increased this five (5) days suspension issued to ten (10) days.
- 41. On or around December 20, 2004, Walker filed a complaint with Chief Scott about Lt. O'Connell's November 10th order that reassigned Walker to inside duty (the "Retaliatory Inside Assignment Complaint").
- 42. In the Retaliatory Inside Assignment Complaint, Walker indicated that she believed that Lt. O'Connell had violated the law.
- 43. On or around January 18, 2005, Chief Scott retaliated against Walker for making complaints, including the Dispatch Email Report and the Retaliatory Inside Assignment Complaint, by suspending Walker for five (5) days.
- 44. On or around February 15, 2005, Walker provided the City with written notice that it's retaliatory activities, policies, and/or practices were in violation of the Massachusetts Whistleblower Statute, Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 149, Section 185. See Whistleblower Notice, dated February 15, 2005, attached hereto as Exhibit A.
- Walker requested and obtained a right to sue letter from the EEOC on January 11, 2005.

COUNT I - DISCRIMINATION BASED ON GENDER (G.L. Ch. 151B)

- 46. Paragraphs 1 through 46 are repeated, reiterated and realleged as if fully set forth herein.
- 47. The City intentionally discriminated against Walker on the basis of her gender.
- 48. The actions and conduct of the City, through its officials, agents and/or employees, violated Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 151B, § 4 (1)
- 49. As a result, Walker has suffered substantial damages, including lost income, damage to her reputation and career, and emotional distress.

COUNT II - DISCRIMINATION BASED ON GENDER (42 U.S.C. §2000)

- 50. Paragraphs 1 through 50 are repeated, reiterated and realleged as if fully set forth herein.
- 51. The City intentionally discriminated against Walker on the basis of her gender.
- 52. The actions and conduct of the City, through its officials, agents and/or employees, violated title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. § 2000e et seq.).
- 53. As a result, Walker has suffered substantial damages, including lost income, damage to her reputation and career, and emotional distress.

COUNT III - DISCRIMINATION BASED ON RACE (G.L. Ch. 151B)

- 54. Paragraphs 1 through 54 are repeated, reiterated and realleged as if fully set forth herein.
- 55. The City intentionally discriminated against Walker on the basis of her race.
- 56. The actions and conduct of the City, through its officials, agents and/or employees, violated Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 151B, § 4 (1)
- 57. As a result, Walker has suffered substantial damages, including lost income, damage to her reputation and career, and emotional distress.

COUNT IV - DISCRIMINATION BASED ON RACE (42 U.S.C. §2000)

- 58. Paragraphs 1 through 58 are repeated, reiterated and realleged as if fully set forth herein.
- 59. The City intentionally discriminated against Walker on the basis of her race.
- 60. The actions and conduct of the City, through its officials, agents and/or employees, violated title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. § 2000e et seq.).
- 61. As a result, Walker has suffered substantial damages, including lost income, damage to her reputation and career, and emotional distress.

COUNT V - DISCRIMINATION BASED ON SEXUAL ORIENTATION (G.L. Ch. 151B)

- 62. Paragraphs 1 through 24 are repeated, reiterated and realleged as if fully set forth herein.
- 63. The City intentionally discriminated against Walker on the basis of her sexual orientation.
- 64. The actions and conduct of the City, through its officials, agents and/or employees, violated Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 151B, § 4 (1)
- 65. As a result, Walker has suffered substantial damages, including lost income, damage to her reputation and career, and emotional distress.

COUNT VI: RACIAL HARASSMENT (G.L. Ch. 151B)

- Walker repeats and reallages the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 40 as if full set forth herein.
- 67. The actions and conduct of the City, through its officials, agents, and/or employees, created a hostile work environment for Walker based on her race, in violation of Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 151B.
- 68. The hostile environment was sufficiently severe and pervasive as to interfere with Walker's ability to perform her duties and responsibilities.
- 69. As a result of the above-described actions, Walker has suffered substantial damages, including lost income, damage to her reputation and career, and emotional distress.

COUNT VII: RACIAL HARASSMENT (42 U.S.C. §2000)

- 70. Walker repeats and reallaeges the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 70 as if full set forth herein.
- 71. The actions and conduct of the City, through its officials, agents, and/or employees, created a hostile work environment for Walker based on her race, in violation of title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. § 2000e et seq.).
- 72. The hostile environment was sufficiently severe and pervasive as to interfere

- with Walker's ability to perform her duties and responsibilities.
- 73. As a result of the above-described actions, Walker has suffered substantial damages, including lost income, damage to her reputation and career, and emotional distress.

COUNT VIII: SEXUAL HARASSMENT (G.L. Ch. 1518)

- 74. Walker repeats and reallaeges the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 74 as if full set forth herein.
- 75. The actions and conduct of the City, through its officials, agents, and/or employees, created a hostile work environment for Walker based on her sex, in violation of Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 151B.
- 76. The hostile environment was sufficiently severe and pervasive as to interfere with Walker's ability to perform her duties and responsibilities.
- 77. As a result of the above-described actions, Walker has suffered substantial damages, including lost income, damage to her reputation and career, and emotional distress.

COUNT IX: SEXUAL HARASSMENT (42 U.S.C. §2000)

- 78. Walker repeats and reallaeges the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 78 as if full set forth herein.
- 79. The actions and conduct of the City, through its officials, agents, and/or employees, created a hostile work environment for Walker based on her sex, in violation of title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. § 2000e et seq.).
- 80. The hostile environment was sufficiently severe and pervasive as to interfere with Walker's ability to perform her duties and responsibilities.
- 81. As a result of the above-described actions, Walker has suffered substantial damages, including lost income, damage to her reputation and career, and emotional distress

COUNT X: HARASSMENT BASED ON SEXUAL ORIENTATION (G.L. Ch. 151B)

82. Walker repeats and reallaeges the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through

- 82 as if full set forth herein.
- 83. The actions and conduct of the City, through its officials, agents, and/or employees, created a hostile work environment for Walker based on her sexual orientation, in violation of Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 151B.
- 84. The hostile environment was sufficiently severe and pervasive as to interfere with Walker's ability to perform her duties and responsibilities.
- 85. As a result of the above-described actions, Walker has suffered substantial damages, including lost income, damage to her reputation and career, and emotional distress.

COUNT XI: RETALIATION (42 U.S.C. §2000)

- Walker repeats and realleges the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 86 as if fully set forth herein.
- Walker engaged in protected activities, including but not limited to opposing practices made unlawful by Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. § 2000e et seq.).
- 88. The City, through its officials, agents, and/or employees, illegally retaliated against Walker for engaging in activities protected by title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. § 2000e et seq.).
- 89. The City's retaliatory actions and conduct violate title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. § 2000e et seq.).
- 90. As a result, Walker has suffered substantial damages, including lost income, damage to her reputation and career, and emotional distress.

COUNT XII: RETALIATION (G.L. Ch. 151B)

- 91. Walker repeats and realleges the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 91 as if fully set forth herein.
- 92. Walker engaged in protected activities, including but not limited to opposing practices made unlawful by Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 151B.
- 93. The City, through its officials, agents, and/or employees, illegally retaliated against Walker for engaging in activities protected by Mass. Gen. Laws ch.

151B.

- 94. The City, through its agents, employees and servants, also attempted to coerce, intimidate, threaten and interfere with Walker's exercise of her rights granted or protected by Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 151B.
- 95. The City's actions and conduct violate Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 151B, §§ 4(4) and 4(4A).
- 96. As a result, Walker has suffered substantial damages, including lost income, damage to her reputation and career, and emotional distress.

COUNT XIII: RETALIATION (G.L. Ch. 149 §185)

- 97. Walker repeats and realleges the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 97 as if fully set forth herein.
- 98. Walker engaged in protected activities, including but not limited to disclosing activities, policies and practices which Walker reasonably believed were violations of the law, or a rule or regulation promulgated pursuant to law; and disclosing activities, policies and practices which Walker reasonably believed were posing a risk to public health and safety.
- 99. The City, through its officials, agents, and/or employees, illegally retaliated against Walker for engaging in activities protected by the Massachusetts Whistleblower Statute, Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 149, Section 185.
- 100. The City's actions and conduct violate Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 149, Section 185.
- 101. As a result, Walker has suffered substantial damages, including lost income, damage to her reputation and career, and emotional distress.

COUNT XIV - DISCRIMINATION BASED ON RACE (42 U.S.C. §1981)

- 102. Paragraphs 1 through 102 are repeated, reiterated and realleged as if fully set forth herein.
- 103. The City intentionally discriminated against Walker on the basis of her race.
- 104. The actions and conduct of the City, through its officials, agents and/or

employees, violated title 42 U.S.C. § 1981.

105. As a result, Walker has suffered substantial damages, including lost income, damage to her reputation and career, and emotional distress.

COUNT XV - RETALIATION BASED ON EXERCISE OF FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS (42 U.S.C. §1983)

- 106. Paragraphs 1 through 106 are repeated, reiterated and realleged as if fully set forth herein.
- 107. Walker engaged in speech activities which were protected by the First Amendment of the United States Constitution.
- 108. The City, through its officials, agents, and/or employees, retaliated against Walker for engaging in speech activities protected by the First Amendment of the United States Constitution.
- 109. The City's actions and conduct violate 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
- 110. As a result, Walker has suffered substantial damages, including lost income, damage to her reputation and career, and emotional distress.

THE PLAINTIFF DEMANDS A TRIAL BY JURY ON ALL COUNTS SO TRIABLE.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff, Tammy Walker, hereby respectfully requests that this Honorable Court:

- 1. Enter judgment in her favor on all Counts of the Complaint;
- Award compensatory damages;
- Award punitive damages;
- 4. Award multiple damages under Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 149, Section 185;
- 5. Award reasonable attorney's fees and costs;
- Award appropriate interest; and
- Award any other relief which this Court deems to be appropriate.

The Plaintiff, Tammy Walker By Her Attorney

Tani E. Sapirstein, Esq. BBO #236850 SAPIRSTEIN & SAPIRSTEIN, P.C. 1341 Main Street, 3rd Floor

1341 Main Street, 3rd Floor Springfield, MA 01103 Tel: (413) 827-7500 Fax: (413) 827-7797

Date: March 29, 2005

K:\WP61\CASEFILE\Walker\complaint.wpd

©JS 44 (Rev. 3/99)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS	<i>g</i>	odeen (SEI	DEFENDA	NS ON THE REVERSE OF	THE FORM.)	
Walker, 5	^r amm <i>v</i>			·· -		
,	· ····································		City c			
(F	of First Listed Plaintiff Hampden EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)		NOTE: IN L	idence of First Listed (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA AND CONDEMNATION CASES, ND INVOLVED.	Hampden ASES ONLY) , USE THE LOCATION OF THE	
1341 Main	when, Address, and Telephone Number) PITSTEIN (413)827-750 & SAPIRSTEIN, P.C. Street - 3rd Floor d, MA 01103 DICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)		Attorneys (If Carol MORRIS 1500 M	Known) Sakowski Lync ON, MAHONEY & ain Street, S	MILLER, LLP te. 2400	
F1		(For Di	versity Cases Only)	S(Place an "X" in One Box for Plai; tiff and One Box for De fendant)	
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	X 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	Citizen	of This State	DEF 1 1 Incorporated of Business	or Principal Place ☐ 4 ☐ 14 In This State	
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citi zenship of Parties in Item III)	Citizen	of Another State 1		nd Principal Place ☐ 5 ☐ 5 In Another State	
737 374			or Subject of a [gn Country	☐ 3 ☐ 3 Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6	
IV. NAT URE OF SUI	The one box only)	- 10101	en County			
110 Insurance	TORTS PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJURY		ITURE/PENALT	Y BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
☐ 240 Torts to Land ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability ☐ 290 All Other Real Property	310 Airplane		LABOR Sair Labor Sandards Act Abor/M gmt. Relations Abor/M gmt. Reporting E Disclosure Act Sailway Labor Act Sther Labor Latigation mpl. Ret. Inc. ecurity Act	B64 SSID Title XVI 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAXSUITS 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	400 State Reap portionment 410 Antitust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/et: 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 810 Selective Service 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 891 Agricultural Acts 892 Economic Stabilization Act 893 Environmental Matters 894 Energy Allocation Act 895 Freedom of Information Act 900 Appeal of Fee Determinating Matters 950 Constitutionality of State Statues 890 Other Statutory Actions	
X 1 Original D 2 Re- Proceeding Sta	Appenate Court	⁴ Reinstated Reopened	or □ 5 (specif	erred from r district y) 6 Multidistr; Litigation	Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment	
42 USC § 200	james statutes titless diversity.)			2004	,	
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	UNDER F.R.C.P. 23	DEMAN	Americ D		f demanded in complaint: ↓□ Yes □ No	
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	(S) instructions): JUDG E			DOCKET NUMBER	X	
3/29/05 OR OFFICE USE ONLY	SIGNATURE OF ATTO	RNEY OF REC	ORD			
BECEIPE :	OUNAPPLYING IFP	93	JUDGE	MAG. JUDG	E	

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

1.	Title of	case (na	ame of first party on e	ach side only	n) Walker v	Cery	of 14	hlyok	<u>o</u> .		
2.		Category in which the case belongs based upon the numbered nature of suit code listed on the civil cover sheet. (See local rule 40.1(a)(1)).									
		ſ.	160, 410, 470, R.2	3, REGARDLI	ESS OF NATURE OF SU	IT.					
	II. 195, 368, 400, 440, 441-444, 540, 550, 555, 625, 710, 720, 730, 740, 790, 791, 820*, 830*, 840*, 850, 890, 892-894, 895, 950. *Also complete AO 120 for patent, trademark of the complete AO 120 for										
		III.		345, 350, 35	0, 230, 240, 245, 290, 31 5, 360, 362, 365, 370, 37						
		IV.	220, 422, 423, 430 690, 810, 861-865,		0, 610, 620, 630, 640, 65 i, 900.	0, 660,					
	_	٧.	150, 152, 153.								
3.	Title an district	d numbe please ir	er, if any, of related candicate the title and n	ises. (See lo	cat rule 40.1(g)). If more first filed case in this c	e than o ourt.	ne prior re	elated ca	se has been f	iled in this	
4.	Has a p	rior actio	on between the same	parties and b	ased on the same clain	ever b	een filed ii	n this co NO	ourt?		
5.	Does th	e compla	aint in this case ques	tion the cons	titutionality of an act of	congre	ss affectin	ng the pu	ıblic interest?	(See 28	
	_	,	A. or an officer, agent	or employee	of the U.S. a narty?	YES		NO			
	,		or all officer, agen	or employee	of the o.s. a party?	YES		NO			
5.	Is this c	ase requ	ired to be heard and	determined b	y a district court of thre	e judge YES	s pursuan	nt to title NO	28 USC §228	4?	
7.	Do <u>all</u> o Massac	f the part husetts (ties in this action, ex "governmental agend	cluding gove cies"), residi	rnmental agencies of th ng in Massachusetts re	e unite side in t YES	d states ar he same d	nd the Co livision? NO	ommonwealth	of Rule 40.1(d)	
		A.	If yes, in which div	ision do <u>all</u> o	f the non-governmental	parties	reside?				
			Eastern Division		Central Division			West	ern Division		
		B.	If no, in which divi- agencies, residing	sion do the m in Massacht	najority of the plaintiffs usetts reside?	or the o	nly parties	s, exclud	ling governme	ental	
			Eastern Division		Central Division			West	ern Division		
3.	If filing a submit a	a Notice o	of Removal - are there e sheet identifying th	any motion: e motions)	s pending in the state c	ourt req	uiring the	attentio	n of this Cour	t? (If yes,	
				•		YES		NO			
		PE OR F S NAME	PRINT) <u>Tani Sapi</u>	المرجود							
					001015:00						
			307 - 750()	315	PRINGFIELD ,	<u> </u>	01103				
			3CV 1 - 13UU					Co	oversheetlocal.v	vpd - 10/17/02)	

district of the second communications and the second communications are second communications.